

REMARKS

Claims 1-45 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 18, 29, 34 and 43 have been amended. Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Rejection of Claims 34-42 Under 35 USC 101

Claim 34 has been amended, such that claims 34-42 are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Double-Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-16 and 45 stand provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting. The Applicants' attorney will respond in a more substantive fashion at such time as the conflicting claims have been issued.

Claim Objections

The second occurrence of claim 38 has been renumbered as claim 39 according to the Examiner's suggestion. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

Rejection of Claims 1, 4-9, 34-37 and 43 Under 35 USC 102(b) As Being Anticipated By

Lehman

Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites a front-end circuit operable to receive a plurality of radio signals transmitted across a frequency band and generate an analog signal simultaneously carrying a plurality of channels within said frequency band; an analog to digital converter coupled to said front-end circuit, said analog to digital converter operable to receive and convert said analog signal to a digital signal carrying said plurality of channels within said frequency

band; and a digital processing system coupled to said analog to digital converter, said digital processing system operable to receive said digital signal and substantially simultaneously generate from said digital signal a plurality of output signals corresponding to at least one of said plurality of channels within said frequency band.

In contrast, Lehman fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations, as amended. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Claims 34 and 43

Claims 34 and 43 are patentable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1.

Claims 4-9 and 35-37

Claims 4-9 and 35-37 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claims 1 and 34.

Rejection of Claims 1-2, 5-8, 18-19, 21-23, 28-31, 33-36, 38, 41, and 43-44 Under 35 USC

102(b) As Being Anticipated By Bexten

Bexten, like Lehman, as discussed above with reference to claim 1, fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of the independent claims, as amended. As such, the rejected dependent claims are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from the rejected independent claims. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5-8, 18-23, 25, 34-36, 41 and 43 Under 35 USC 102(e) or 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Kaminski

Kaminski, like Lehman, as discussed above with reference to claim 1, fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of the independent claims, as amended. As such, the rejected

dependent claims are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from the rejected independent claims. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

**Rejection of Claims 9, 24, 32 and 37 Under 35 USC 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over
Bexten In View of Lehman**

As discussed above, Bexten and Lehman fail to teach or suggest the claimed limitations of the independent claims, as amended. As such, the rejected dependent claims are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from the rejected independent claims. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

**Rejection of Claims 2-4, 9-10, 14-15, 17, 24-25, 27, 37, 39-40, 42, and 44-45 Under 35 USC
103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Kaminski In View of Phillips**

Phillips fails to supply the teachings missing from Kaminski with regard to the claimed limitations of the independent claims, as amended. As such, the rejected dependent claims are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from the rejected independent claims. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

**Rejection of Claims 11-13, 16 and 26 Under 35 USC 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over
Kaminski In View of Phillips and Bugeja**

Bugeja fails to supply the teachings missing from Kaminski and Phillips with regard to the claimed limitations of the independent claims, as amended. As such, the rejected dependent claims are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from the rejected independent claims. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims of the pending application are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment, withdrawal of the rejections, allowance, and early passage through issuance. If the examiner has any questions, the examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}

/P.G. Scott Born/

P.G. Scott Born
Registration No. 40,523
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491